



Fw: SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002

El Jay to: Fuhs Stephanie, Ray Caren

Cc: "Holliday Istar"

01/08/2014 05:39 PM

From: "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>
To: "Fuhs Stephanie" <sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>, "Ray Caren" <cray@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: "Holliday Istar" <istardoc@verizon.net>

FYI ---any questions just call 343-1949 -- appreciate your help
March 2005

Avila/Winterhaven Industrial Pocket in Residential

Chronological List of Events

1978 Union on Oil pushed for Zone change from Residential to Industrial - Residents all objected per Jean Gescheider

1979 City Services and Gas tried to build huge oil facility on Callender - an 8 year battle ensued, and finally the matter was dropped, most of the properties reverted to their original residential zoning. The remainder to follow later.

1987 Petition to rezone to residential organized by Bob Elston submitted to Jim Lopes. Promised it would be taken care of with the South County Update.

1988-89 Several neighbors checked with Planning prior to purchasing their homes and were again assured this property would be zoned RS

1990 Meadows' six acres on the back of this parcel tried to subdivide into four residential lots. After an investment of over \$20,000, they finally had to back out as County insisted on expensive road improvements including lowering the hill 12 feet. This hill is the same that fronts the ten acres.

1991 Owner puts in for an industrial subdivision of the ten acres to four one acre and a remainder. In spite of strong opposition, it is approved. The road safety concerns were fluffed over by County insisting all road improvements were going to be taken care of by Meadows (3 minutes no rebuttal law!!) Meadows vehemently denied making any offer to take care of the roads. County and Ruth Brackett (our Supervisor) told community to back off and stop worrying as just as soon as the Update was complete it would revert to ten acre residential.

1994 Private meeting with owner and County --- because of an apparent oil spill, they decide to leave it industrial. No notification was sent out.

1996 Community learns of partnership between then owner Kiler and Avila. Latter eventually purchased the ten acres for \$100,000 on paper. Mr. Kiler later claimed he was cheated out of all the money.

1997 Avila starts clearing the forest, burning, burying uprooted stumps in 50-foot pits (local Sheriff witnessed) plus doing massive grading - All without permits. He got a tiny fine. LUO 23.05.064 states any tree removed to accommodate new development must be replaced on site. Also large water well put in.

1998 Extensions should have run out in 1996, but they never seem to!! LUO 23.02.050

1999 Plans for a ½ acre metal structure is applied for - In spite of the community getting the input of outside engineers, County ignores the road safety issues.

2000 Planning Commission is very disturbed about the entire project and after much deliberation make a decision to approve the MUP, but with a long list of requirements including "any necessary changes to the vertical curve for safe sight distance". This latter was considered an important item, not only by the outside engineers, but also by our local police and fire departments.

2001 Public Works decided to oppose the Planning Commission since it was too costly and allow the project to proceed without taking care of the road safety conditions. They instead said they would put up a stop sign and reduce the speed to 20 mph - but no one is there to enforce this!! Local Law Enforcement says sign would do more harm than good as it gives a false sense of security.

2003 The buildings are to look residential to try and blend in, but the first one they put up is completing lacking in any attractiveness. Now the County hopes to try and hide it.

This has been one mistake after another, and now they are trying to divide up the remainder, which we were promised would never happen.

-----Original Message-----

From: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us

Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 4:34 PM

To: cray@co.slo.ca.us

Cc: eruth@co.slo.ca.us ; El Jay ; brobeson@co.slo.ca.us

Subject: RE: SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002

Hi Caren,

The current project was submitted on May 23, 2013. It is for a condominium of 6 units within and existing industrial building. The project was placed on hold pending some issues primarily concerning previous conditions placed on the subdivision and land use permit for the existing building. The project was accepted for processing in December after the applicant installed some landscaping along Winterhaven Way. Staff did not require extensive landscaping for acceptance of the project since there is a possibility that the project would not get approved. When the project goes forward for hearing (tentatively scheduled for February's SRB meeting), conditions will be placed on the project for compliance with previous landscape standards and maintenance of the landscaping.

There was a subdivision approved in 1988 (CO 88-0292) that created four parcels on the south side and a remainder parcel on the north side of Precision Place. The map recorded in August 2000. A land use permit (D980214P) was approved in July 2000 for the 18,000 square foot building on Lot 1 of CO 88-0292. The conditions of approval included limitations on use, landscaping improvements, traffic improvements, etc. The building was finished in 2005 and has been vacant for several years. In that time, ownership has changed, there have been issues with the water company and water supply, and the landscaping wasn't maintained.

The land is zoned Industrial. The condominium project does not require an upzone, as industrial condominiums are allowable with a planned development per section 22.22.100 of the Land Use Ordinance. The parcels are 1 acre in size and were zoned Industrial in 1988 when the property was subdivided. I'll check into what it was prior to that. They are industrial condominiums with limitations on use per the previous land use permit approvals. I don't know if the applicant has specific tenants/purchasers lined up yet. Hope that helps, I'll get back to you on the zoning prior to 1988 question.

Stephanie Fuhs
Planner
County of San Luis Obispo
805.781.5721 (office)
805.781.1242 (fax)
email: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us
website: sloplanning.org

From: Caren Ray/BOS/COSLO
To: Stephanie Fuhs/Planning/COSLO@Wings
Cc: Elizabeth Ruth/BOS/COSLO@Wings, "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>
Date: 01/08/2014 03:20 PM
Subject: RE: SUB2012-00044 C013-0002

Hi Stephanie-

I have received some constituent objections to this project, so I need to ask a few clarifying questions. First, could you please give me a short history of the project?

Further, how is this land currently zoned? Does the condominium plan require an upzone, and if so, to what level? And how was the land zoned before it was subdivided into the 2.5acre parcels? What kind of condominiums are proposed; residential or commercial? What will their use be, if approved?

Thank you,
Caren

From: Stephanie Fuhs/Planning/COSLO
To: Caren Ray/BOS/COSLO@Wings
Cc: Elizabeth Ruth/BOS/COSLO@Wings, "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>
Date: 12/31/2013 03:14 PM
Subject: RE: SUB2012-00044 C013-0002

Hi all,
The project will go to the Subdivision Review Board because it is a condominium project that will record as one lot and have a concurrent or subsequent condominium plan recorded showing the layout of the individual units. I am planning on scheduling the map for either the February or March SRB meeting. Hope that helps. Let me know if there are further

questions, thank you.

Stephanie Fuhs
Planner
County of San Luis Obispo
805.781.5721 (office)
805.781.1242 (fax)
email: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us
website: sloplanning.org

From: Caren Ray/BOS/COSLO
To: "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>, "<sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>"
<sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Elizabeth Ruth/BOS/COSLO
Date: 12/31/2013 02:19 PM
Subject: RE: SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002

Happy New Year, El Jay,

I will need to do some research on this with staff when I return to the office next week. Thank you for bringing it to my attention. In the meantime, I will have Liz get you the answer do which committee (subdivision review or PC) this will be heard at next, and where and when the meeting will occur.

Caren

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

----- Original Message -----

From : "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>
To : <sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc : <cray@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent on : 12/31 01:54:02 PM PST
Subject : SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002

This project is coming to Land Use on the 13th before it goes to the Subdivision Review Board (or the Planning Commission - which is correct?)

This controversial project has been a major concern of the surrounding RESIDENTIAL community for nearly 2 decades.

The ending results were to apply to the entire TEN acre parcel. Since the community was restricted to 2-1/2 acre minimum, to allow the four one acres plus the remainder was considered a large compromise on the part of the residents. Any structures were supposed to appear to be regular residential.

A major stipulation was the lowering the steep hill on Winterhaven. Originally it was decided to pass this mitigation on to Mr. Meadows who wanted to develop behind the TEN acres. Unfortunately Mr. Meadows was not informed and backed out of any development as too costly.

Now the owner of one of the acres is planning to divide it into 7 parcels as industrial condominiums. There is no HOA, and the County Code Enforcement does not have the man power to discipline the project. There is a list of allowable uses, but who will monitor them.

Suggested landscaping is not adequate. The first planting was allowed to die. Recently few trees have been planted with wood chips as a mulch. Some of these are already dead. The original plans showed a dense planting of attractive full grown trees.

The community has been abused by the County allowing this to occur. Please remember to the residents this is probably the largest investment they will ever make, and now it is being severely devalued.

Regards

El-Jay Hansson

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]



SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002

El Jay to: sfuhs

Cc: cray

12/31/2013 01:54 PM

From: "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>

To: <sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>

Cc: <cray@co.slo.ca.us>

This project is coming to Land Use on the 13th before it goes to the Subdivision Review Board (or the Planning Commission – which is correct?)

This controversial project has been a major concern of the surrounding RESIDENTIAL community for nearly 2 decades.

The ending results were to apply to the entire TEN acre parcel. Since the community was restricted to 2-1/2 acre minimum, to allow the four one acres plus the remainder was considered a large compromise on the part of the residents. Any structures were supposed to appear to be regular residential.

A major stipulation was the lowering the steep hill on Winterhaven. Originally it was decided to pass this mitigation on to Mr. Meadows who wanted to develop behind the TEN acres. Unfortunately Mr. Meadows was not informed and backed out of any development as too costly.

Now the owner of one of the acres is planning to divide it into 7 parcels as industrial condominiums. There is no HOA, and the County Code Enforcement does not have the man power to discipline the project. There is a list of allowable uses, but who will monitor them.

Suggested landscaping is not adequate. The first planting was allowed to die. Recently few trees have been planted with wood chips as a mulch. Some of these are already dead. The original plans showed a dense planting of attractive full grown trees.

The community has been abused by the County allowing this to occur. Please remember to the residents this is probably the largest investment they will ever make, and now it is being severely devalued.

Regards

El-Jay Hansson



Re: SUB2012-00044 DeGroot
Istar and Doc Holliday to: sfuhs

10/31/2013 03:30 PM

From: Istar and Doc Holliday <istardoc@verizon.net>
To: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us

Hi, Stephanie,

Just checked the DeGroot "landscaping"(chips applied around shrubbery previously planted in dispute with Planning and neighbors but to which water was cut off as soon as app. was approved, apparently). What's to stop him from doing this again?

Istar

On Oct 23, 2013, at 9:36 AM, sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us wrote:

> Hi Istar,
> The Degroot parcel map is on hold pending installation of landscaping along
> Winterhaven. Once the landscaping is installed, we will move forward to
> reviewing the proposal. The Land Use Ordinance does allow an owner to
> request condominiums or planned developments within the Industrial and
> Commercial Service land use categories, so we will evaluate it under those
> regulations.
>
> As for other buildings, I don't show any record of any recent land use or
> building permits within that subdivision. All other previous approvals
> have expired, so any new development would require land use and building
> permit approval. Hope that helps.
>
> Stephanie Fuhs
> Planner
> County of San Luis Obispo
> 805.781.5721 (office)
> 805.781.1242 (fax)
> email: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us
> website: sloplanning.org
>
>
> From: Istar and Doc Holliday <istardoc@verizon.net>
> To: Fuhs Stephanie <sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>
> Date: 10/22/2013 04:55 PM
> Subject: SUB2012-00044 DeGroot
>
>
> Stephanie,
>
> I left a message for Brian this a.m. when a neighbor of this project called
> to say he talked to workers on the site and was told two other other
> buildings are going up , yet we had no resolution to to above referenced
> project as DeGroot refused to resound or appear before the LUC or the SCAC
> to respond to questions about legality of subdividing a one acre parcel
> among 5 "owners" and lack of HOA in proposal to assume responsibility for
> compliance or maintenance of shared property. Brian has not yet
> responded.

>
> What was the outcome of he DeGroot project? ? How are two other buildings
> going up without oversight by planning? Was there an app? hearings?
> Please advise.
>
> This has always been a problem "light industrial" property surrounded by
> residential properties and overseen by "scofflaws" who have not complied
> with any mitigations proposed by Planning from the outset.
>
> Istar
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> [Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]
>



Re: SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002 DeGroot
Istar and Doc Holliday to: sfuhs
Cc: Hansson El-Jay

08/20/2013 01:02 PM

From: Istar and Doc Holliday <istardoc@verizon.net>
To: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us
Cc: Hansson El-Jay <hansson@verizon.net>

Thanks for keeping us in the loop, Stephanie. His "neighbors," too, are aware of his independent spirit when it comes to compliance. They're still waiting for the required landscaping along both the west side of his Butler Building and Winterhaven "required" for the last approved permits.

Istar

On Aug 20, 2013, at 9:10 AM, sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us wrote:

> Hi Istar,
> Thank you for the update. We are still working through the issues that you
> raised in your e-mail. Since there has been a historical lack of
> compliance with previous conditions of approval on the property, we are
> reluctant to move forward with additional approvals on the site. I'm not
> sure at this time how to bring the site to compliance to be in a position
> to move forward. Sorry I don't have more information for you right now,
> but we are still figuring out how to proceed with the request as well.

>
> Stephanie Fuhs
> Planner
> County of San Luis Obispo
> 805.781.5721 (office)
> 805.781.1242 (fax)
> email: sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us
> website: sloplanning.org

>
>
> From: Istar and Doc Holliday <istardoc@verizon.net>
> To: Fuhs Stephanie <sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>
> Date: 08/19/2013 11:53 AM
> Subject: SUB2012-00044 CO13-0002 DeGroot

>
> Hi, Stephanie,

>
> DeGroot never responded to SCAC's request for input, so the South County
> Advisory Council voted to recommend denial.

>
> However, the project came up for an update at the Land Use Committee today
> as the applicant has a reputation of going his own route for project
> approvals. What has been the outcome of his request for a subdivision of
> one Butler Building on his acre into 6 "industrial parcels" ? There were
> many questions about the lack of specs for responsibility for maintenance
> management, property liability, etc. if the application were approved.

>
> Istar
>



Winterhaven - D980214P

El Jay to: sfuhs

05/28/2013 04:47 PM

Cc: "Pedrotti Brian", "Woodson Dan", "Holliday Istar", "McCarthy Vince",
"Hansson Hans", "Wright Richard"

From: "El Jay" <hansson@verizon.net>

To: <sfuhs@co.slo.ca.us>

Cc: "Pedrotti Brian" <bpedrotti@co.slo.ca.us>, "Woodson Dan" <William_woodson@hotmail.com>,
"Holliday Istar" <istardoc@verizon.net>, "McCarthy Vince" <vincemcc@netzero.net>,
"Hansson Hans" <hansson11@verizon.net>, "Wright Richard" <Zwrights229@aol.com>

1 attachment



Chron.doc

The neighborhood has suffered with this ugly edifice for years. This new plan does nothing to protect the industrial traffic that will be forced to use Winterhaven. Public works will not allow ingress and egress from Highway 1.

I have a very thick file pertaining to this project which was promised to be developed residential.

Six units of 3,000 s. ft. each must be limited to the uses in Exhibit B Conditions, which apply to all parcels in the ten acre property.

March 2005

Avila/Winterhaven Industrial Pocket in Residential

Chronological List of Events

1978 Union on Oil pushed for Zone change from Residential to Industrial – Residents all objected per Jean Gescheider

1979 City Services and Gas tried to build huge oil facility on Callender – an 8 year battle ensued, and finally the matter was dropped, most of the properties reverted to their original residential zoning. The remainder to follow later.

1987 Petition to rezone to residential organized by Bob Elston submitted to Jim Lopes. Promised it would be taken care of with the South County Update.

1988-89 Several neighbors checked with Planning prior to purchasing their homes and were again assured this property would be zoned RS

1990 Meadows' six acres on the back of this parcel tried to subdivide into four residential lots. After an investment of over \$20,000, they finally had to back out as County insisted on expensive road improvements including lowering the hill 12 feet. This hill is the same that fronts the ten acres.

1991 Owner puts in for an industrial subdivision of the ten acres to four one acre and a remainder. In spite of strong opposition, it is approved. The road safety concerns were fluffed over by County insisting all road improvements were going to be taken care of by Meadows (3 minutes no rebuttal law!!) Meadows vehemently denied making any offer to take care of the roads. County and Ruth Brackett (our Supervisor) told community to back off and stop worrying as just as soon as the Update was complete it would revert to ten acre residential.

1994 Private meeting with owner and County --- because of an apparent oil spill, they decide to leave it industrial. No notification was sent out.

1996 Community learns of partnership between then owner Kiler and Avila. Latter eventually purchased the ten acres for \$100,000 on paper. Mr. Kiler later claimed he was cheated out of all the money.

1997 Avila starts clearing the forest, burning, burying uprooted stumps in 50-foot pits (local Sheriff witnessed) plus doing massive grading – All without permits. He got a tiny fine. **LUO 23.05.064** states any tree removed to accommodate new development must be replaced on site. Also large water well put in.

1998 Extensions should have run out in 1996, but they never seem to!! **LUO 23.02.050**

1999 Plans for a ½ acre metal structure is applied for – In spite of the community getting the input of outside engineers, County ignores the road safety issues.

2000 Planning Commission is very disturbed about the entire project and after much deliberation make a decision to approve the MUP, but with a long list of requirements including “any necessary changes to the vertical curve for safe sight distance”. This latter was considered an important item, not only by the outside engineers, but also by our local police and fire departments.

2001 Public Works decided to oppose the Planning Commission since it was too costly and allow the project to proceed without taking care of the road safety conditions. They instead said they would put up a stop sign and reduce the speed to 20 mph – but no one is there to enforce this!! Local Law Enforcement says sign would do more harm than good as it gives a false sense of security.

2003 The buildings are to look residential to try and blend in, but the first one they put up is completely lacking in any attractiveness. Now the County hopes to try and hide it.

This has been one mistake after another, and now they are trying to divide up the remainder, which we were promised would never happen.